

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,494	RHODES, HOWARD E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PAUL BERARDESCA	2622	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) PAUL BERARDESCA. (3) _____.

(2) RYAN FLAX. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 January 2010

Time: 1:33

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

113-115, and 117

Prior art documents discussed:

Bird (US 5,721,422) and Hashimoto et al. (US 6,977,684)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Finding proper language to claim the allowable feature of a diagonal active area between two pixels in a pixel array was discussed to overcome the prior art. A suggestion was made to define the active area as a shape and then define the line segments of the shape to be diagonal. This suggestion was not accepted by Applicant, however, a second suggestion which defines an extension direction of the active area to be diagonal was accepted by Applicant. Both suggestions are attached.